



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Micrasiatic Hellenism, after long and cruel slavery, has at last seen the aurora of its liberty, thanks to the heroism and sacrifice of the Hellenic army. It was with a grievous heart that it followed the discussions of the great powers, who contested the sacred rights of its liberty and life.

The National Micrasiatic Defense, in behalf of the nation, makes appeal to the patriotism of the National Assembly not to abandon the Greeks of Asia Minor, who for 3,000 years have constituted part of the Hellenic family.

The Hellenism of Asia Minor proclaims, in this sacred and critical hour, that it is firmly determined to defend its hearth and religion and will readily sustain any sacrifice necessitated for strengthening the national army.

The special correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor* says of the situation:

The whole Greek and Armenian press unanimously backs up the new patriotic organization and declares that any attempt to evacuate Smyrna will be confronted by the obstinate armed resistance of 1,000,000 Christians.

The Greek paper *Esperini* said:

Greece is ready to put into action any decision of the Allies, save that of the evacuation of Smyrna. It was not for the sake of conquest that we occupied Asia Minor; we came here for the purpose of delivering the oppressed Christians from Turkish despotism.

Greece accepts the proposition of armistice; but the enemy does not show any tendency to do the same. They want Thrace and Smyrna back unconditionally. But we want to declare to the Turks that their wish will never be fulfilled; this is our national pact. In addition, we want to tell them that we will not be contented with that. In the near future we will proceed to declare the union of the occupied territories to the mother country and enlarge our dominion. The Greek sword and cannon will stay firmly in the places where they are, and, if it be necessary, they will proceed to chastise the enemy.

Ye Greek people, be reminded that Asia Minor will never be evacuated. Such a measure would be a blow to our national existence and magnanimity. Let us today be more optimistic than we were yesterday. Let us have unshakable confidence in our king and government. This is and will be our last word.

Residents are anxiously awaiting the return here of General Papoulias, who is looked for daily, from a visit to Athens to hold a conference with government officials relative to the entire situation in Asia Minor. At the time of the departure of General Papoulias the situation was not considered any too satisfactory, but recent developments have made almost chaotic a situation that was only troubled.

## LETTER BOX

### EDITOR OF ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

In your letter to Mrs. Mead and Mr. Dole you express the opinion that the position of the American Peace Society in our late war, namely, that "the clarion, unmistakable call to every one of us in America was to end the war by winning it," was the position of "sanity." It was the same position as that of the Carnegie Peace Foundation, which took for its motto "Peace through victory." You state that position in other words thus: "There comes a time when war, beating at the doors of a nation, can be overcome in but one of two ways—by succumbing to the enemy or by defeating the enemy."

Will you allow me to question the "sanity" thereof, in the hope that you will defend it or—far better—recant?

Another view of the matter is that of Dean Inge of St. Paul's, London, who said recently: "We used to think that the war was caused by an abstract demon we called Germany and the Germans called Russia or France. Now we are beginning to realize that we were all stark mad together."

Dean Inge's opinion is in harmony with numerous wise judgments of war. William James called war "the wholesale organisation of irrationality and crime." John Hay called it "the most ferocious and futile of human follies." Rousseau, writing of the rulers of his day, whose war-making he attributed to stupidity rather than wickedness, said: "They do not need to be good, generous, disinterested, public-spirited, humane. They may be unjust, greedy, putting their own interest above everything else; we only ask that they shall not be fools, and to this they will come."

It is not the horror of war, but the foolishness of it, that seals its doom. There is a principle of rationality immanent in mankind. Common sense will prevail some time. And common sense cannot tolerate collective homicide. Human life as the condition for the development of personality is the most precious thing in the world. The wholesale slaughter of men by fellow-men, the starvation by blockade of millions of men, women, and children, the destruction of the means of life—in a word, war—seems to be the utmost reach of irrationality, the acme of stupidity.

There is only one conceivable exception to this proposition, one conceivable justification of war, and that is that a certain amount of war will prevent a greater amount which cannot be prevented in any less costly way. While war is intrinsically the most injurious procedure men ever engage in, of course a short war, restricted in extent, is not so bad as a longer and more extensive war. If by one war a worse war is averted, the lesser war is justified. I can imagine no other rational defense of war. Capital punishment is similar. If it saves lives that would otherwise be taken, it is justified.

As to capital punishment, the legal and orderly killing of murderers, the evidence appears to be that it proves morally degrading to the community that employs it and tends in the long run to cheapen human life rather than to protect it. What is the verdict of experience as to the effectiveness of war in preventing future war? Certainly the method has had a fair trial! After ten thousand years of war comes the World War, the most extensive and destructive of all. War has not brought forth peace, but has reproduced itself in forms ever more monstrous.

Some time war will be interpreted aright, will be seen to be futile, and will be abolished. That clear insight will not properly be credited to war, but rather to human reason. By enduring the bitter consequences of folly, men learn at last not to play the fool; but we credit common sense, not folly, for the improvement. War up to the present has seemed to obscure the truth about war. Especially is this the case when war ends in victory. Victory leads to an unjust settlement; it blinds the conquerors with pride; it humiliates the defeated. Thus it tends to produce further war.

As a matter of fact, there is, in the long run, but little difference between victory and defeat. The military issue is of slight importance compared with the inevitable loss involved in war itself. This would be more likely to be perceived if a war should end in a draw, a "peace without victory," upon the exhaustion of both sides. In the height of the late war, Bernard Shaw expressed the hope that the killing might continue till both sides were satiated. "Our duty," said he, "is to keep the Germans from conquering us; their duty is to keep us from conquering them." President Wilson saw with perfect clearness in January, 1917, that only a peace without victory could be a just, and therefore stable, peace. Not three months later he called the nation into war and made such a peace impossible. Neither he nor any one else ever refuted his argument against the desirability of victory, of "winning" the war. Time has proved him absolutely correct. "All the victories of history," says Norman Angell ("The Fruits of Victory," p. xiii), "teach that the one condition of justice in a war settlement is that the aggrieved party should not be in the position of imposing his unrestrained will."

What resulted from our participation in the war? Let me quote those whose opinions command more respect than mine. Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson said in *The Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1921:

"America is largely responsible for our condition. The root of the suffering and ruin of Europe is, of course, the war. In the outbreak of that, it is true, America played no part. But she played a part, and an important one, in its continuance. When she entered the war in 1917, the idea of peace without victory was definitely abandoned, and the war, which would have ended that year, was prolonged until the eventual complete overthrow of the German power by the Allies. It was prolonged by American aid, to the economic ruin, first of central Europe, then of all Europe."

The following is from an editorial in *The New Republic*, September 7, 1921:

"From almost the beginning of the war we were a decisive factor therein. Had we acted promptly, either by accepting the challenge of the invasion of Belgium or by enforcing the rights of neutral trade, our action must have brought the war to a conclusion long before the economic structure of Europe was shattered. The European realized and the American does not, that our interposition by arms was brought about at the very time when both parties to the contest were on the point of taking our advice as to peace without victory. On this point serious thinkers like Mr. Lowes Dickinson and frivolous spectators like Colonel Repington are agreed, and the former makes it the basis of his claim of American responsibility to Europe. Just as by an early decision we should have shortened the war, so by a tardy one we prolonged it for a fatal year and a half."

To end a war by winning it is as logical and efficacious as to end a drunken spree by drinking up all the whiskey within reach. Doubtless a war stops when one party to it is utterly exhausted, and doubtless when the strong drink is all swallowed the drinking stops and sobering begins. Drunkards sometimes reform, but often they drink themselves to death. The more they drink, the less likely their reformation. Likewise the intoxication of war tends to develop a tradition and a popular attitude favorable to war. Is there any doubt that our participation in the war set back the cause of peace in our country indefinitely? That, at any rate, will prove to be the case unless those who favored the war see that they made a mistake. If they persist in the notion that our participation was the part of sanity, there will have to be future war to teach the necessary lesson.

There are hopeful signs. The Christian churches of America almost unanimously supported the war. Now many Christian men see clearly that in justifying war they were untrue to the spirit of Christ. From the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America goes forth the exhortation: "Let us insist that war is an unmitigated curse to humanity and a denial of the Christian Gospel. Let us declare plainly that in every war the Son of Man is put to shame anew, and that every battlefield is a Calvary on which Christ is crucified afresh."

Despite your present state of mind, I shall cherish the hope that ere long the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, organ of the venerable American Peace Society, will render a great service to the good cause for which it stands by the clearness and vigor with which it will expose the terrible blunder, the immeasurable crime against humanity, of which we were guilty in entering the war. Alas, the resources that might have been used to heal the wounds of the broken peoples of Europe were poured out only to add to their woes! Here at home the principles of democracy were abandoned, dissent was denied a hearing, our hundred millions of people went crazy, more crazy even than the European belligerents. Recriminations are useless, but it is high time for men of intelligence to see the truth about the war and to speak it. Every man likes to save his face, I know. But it is better that a man should save his soul!

In the future, perhaps not very distant, when war has been abolished as the futility, the barbarity, the idiocy that

it is, the historian of our times will be amazed and amused to read of a peace organization that sent forth a "clarion, unmistakable call to end the war by winning it," and of another that made "Peace through victory" its motto. He will note how each group that succumbed to the war mania rationalized its folly in accordance with its most cherished principles.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

BROOKLINE, MASS., April 19, 1922.

#### REPLY

We appreciate Dr. Pinkham's communication and thank him not only for his expression of views, but particularly for the paragraph which reads:

"There is only one conceivable exception to this proposition, one conceivable justification of war, and that is that a certain amount of war will prevent a greater amount which cannot be prevented in any less costly way. While war is intrinsically the most injurious procedure men ever engage in, of course a short war, restricted in extent, is not so bad as a longer and more extensive war. If by one war a worse war is averted, the lesser war is justified. I can imagine no other rational defense of war. Capital punishment is similar. If it saves lives that would otherwise be taken, it is justified."

So far as the author criticizes the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, it seems to us that he has in these words answered the criticism with a sufficing completeness.—THE EDITOR.

APRIL 20, 1922.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,  
Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We are thinking of what may be obtained now under this Administration. The fruits of the Washington Conference are garnered. What next?

It will be conceded that, whatever may be expected in some future time, there is no hope for our entry into the League of Nations with the Senate as now composed. Still less is there hope for a new and continuing association of nations, for if it could pass the Senate with the required two-thirds vote (which admits of the gravest doubt), it is certain that the nations of Europe would not forsake the going League to join it.

But is there not encouragement to believe that this Administration would welcome an earnest expression from the people in favor of our becoming a party to the Permanent Court of International Justice? And if the President proposes it, are there not good reasons to believe that two-thirds of the Senate would ratify it?

With these thoughts in mind and stirring our hearts, this committee (one of the youngest and far from the most important) is taking the initiative in writing to much older and more important societies to very respectfully request an interchange of views as to the advisability of united and continuous action in favor of our early participation in the court.

Counsel or suggestion from your society will be esteemed of great value.

Very sincerely yours,

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL PUBLICITY IN THE  
INTERESTS OF WORLD PEACE,

CHARLES H. RICHARDS,  
*Secretary.*

We desire to express our personal and hearty approval of the suggestions of the foregoing letter.

ALTON R. PARKER.  
S. PARKES CADMAN.  
GEO. HAVEN PUTNAM.  
ADOLPH LEWISOHN.  
MELVILLE FOREST.  
SAMUEL COLCORD.